arXiv:1702.03667v1 [math.CO] 13 Feb 2017

Finding Hamilton cycles in random intersection graphs.

Katarzyna Rybarczyk*
Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Adam Mickiewicz University, 60–769 Poznań, Poland
kryba@amu.edu.pl

Abstract

The construction of the random intersection graph model is based on a random family of sets. Such structures, which are derived from intersections of sets, appear in a natural manner in many applications. In this article we study the problem of finding a Hamilton cycle in a random intersection graph. To this end we analyse a classical algorithm for finding Hamilton cycles in random graphs (algorithm HAM) and study its efficiency on graphs from a family of random intersection graphs (denoted here by $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$). We prove that the threshold function for the property of HAM constructing a Hamilton cycle in $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ is the same as the threshold function for the minimum degree at least two. Until now, known algorithms for finding Hamilton cycles in $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ were designed to work in very small ranges of parameters and, unlike HAM, used the structure of the family of random sets.

keywords: random intersection graphs, Hamilton cycle, algorithm.

1 Introduction

Since its introduction by Karoński, Scheinerman, and Singer–Cohen [12] the random intersection graph model and its generalisations have proven to have many applications. To mention just a few: "gate matrix layout" for VLSI design (see e.g. [12]), cluster analysis and classification (see e.g. [10]), analysis of complex networks (see e.g. [1, 8]), secure wireless networks (see e.g. [4]) or epidemics ([7]). For more details we refer the reader to survey papers [2, 3].

In the random intersection graph model $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ to each vertex from a vertex set $\mathcal{V}$ ($|\mathcal{V}| = n$) we assign a random set of its features $\mathcal{W}(v)$ from an auxiliary set $\mathcal{W}$ ($|\mathcal{W}| =$

*supported by NCN (National Science Center) grant 2014/13/D/ST1/01175

$m(n)$). For each $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and $v \in \mathcal{V}$ we have $\Pr(w \in \mathcal{W}(v)) = p$ ($p = p(n) \in (0,1)$) independently of all other elements from $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{W}$. We connect vertices v and v' by an edge if sets $\mathcal{W}(v)$ and $\mathcal{W}(v')$ intersect.

In the course of last years various properties of random intersection graph were studied. However still little is known about algorithms which might efficiently construct or find structures in random intersection graphs. In this article we address the problem of efficiently finding a Hamilton cycle in $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$. The problem of determining a threshold function for the property of having a Hamilton cycle in random intersection graph has already been studied by several authors, for example: Efthymiou and Spirakis [9], Rybarczyk [15] (both for the model considered in this paper), and Bloznelis and Damarackas [5] (for the uniform random intersection graph model). Here we analyse algorithmic aspects of the problem of finding a Hamilton cycle in $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$. In [14] Raptopoulos and Spirakis proposed a randomised algorithm which with probability tending to 1 as $n \to \infty$ in polynomial time finds a Hamilton cycle in $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ if $m/(n \ln n) \to 0$ and $p = \frac{\ln n + \omega(n)}{m}$ with $\omega(n)$ tending slowly to infinity. Our aim is to show that there exists an algorithm which efficiently finds a Hamilton cycle in $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ for a wider range of parameters n, m, p. To this end we take algorithm HAM introduced by Bollobás, Fenner, and Fieze in [6] and analyse its performance on $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$. We show that the minimum degree at least 2 with probability close to 1 guarantees that HAM successfully finds a Hamilton cycle in $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ in polynomial time.

All limits in the paper are taken as $n \to \infty$. Throughout the paper we use standard asymptotic notation $a_n = o(b_n)$ if $a_n/b_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ and $a_n = O(b_n)$ if there exists a constant C such that $|a_n| \leq C|b_n|$, for large n. By $\mathrm{Bin}(n,p)$ we denote the binomial distribution with parameters n, p. We also use the phrase "with high probability" to say with probability tending to one as n tends to infinity. All inequalities hold for n large enough. We consequently omit $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ and $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ for the sake of clarity of presentation.

2 Main results

Algorithm HAM, as presented in [6], is designed to search for a Hamilton cycle in any graph with the minimum degree at least 2. It is assumed that the vertex set of the input graph is ordered, i.e. $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ (for simplicity we write $v_i < v_j$ if $i < j$). Algorithm HAM utilises Pósa's rotation technique introduced in [13]. Rotation technique uses the fact that, given a path P of length k in a graph $\mathcal{G}$ (i.e. $P = (u_1, \ldots, u_k)$), if there is an edge $e = \{u_k, u_i\}$, $2 \leq i \leq k-2$, we may construct another path of length k denoted by

$$\mathrm{ROTATE}(P, e) = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_i, u_k, u_{k-1}, \ldots, u_{i+1}).$$

We state algorithm HAM as it is in [6] (see Figure 1). In most cases we keep notation consistent with [6].

The main result of this article is the following.

Algorithm HAM

Input: a connected graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, E)$ of minimum degree at least 2, integer d.

begin

$k := 1$;

P_k– the path (v_1, u), where $u = \min\{v : \{v_1, v\} \in E\}$

(L1) **begin** {stage k begins here}

$Q_1 := P_k$, $s := 1$, $t := 1$, $\bar{\delta}(Q_1) := 0$

($\bar{\delta}(Q_s)$ – the number of rotations in the sequence constructing Q_s from Q_1)

repeat (u_0, u_1 – endpoints of Q_s, where $u_0 < u_1$;)

for $i = 0, 1$ **do**

begin

$\{u_i, x_1\}, \ldots, \{u_i, x_p\}$ – all edges incident to u_i and not contained in Q_s, where $x_1 < \ldots < x_p$;

for $j = 1$ **to** p **do**

if x_j is not on Q_s **then**

begin

$P_{k+1} := Q_s + \{u_i, x_j\}$; {extension}

$k := k + 1$; **goto** L1

end

else if $x_j = u_{1-i}$ **then**

begin

let C be the cycle $Q_s + \{u_0, u_1\}$;

if C is a Hamiltonian cycle **then** terminate successfully

else

begin

starting from u_0, let u be the first vertex along Q_s, which is adjacent to some vertex not in C; let v be the lowest numbered neighbour of u not in C and let u' and u'' be the neighbours of u on C, where $u' < u''$, then

$P_{k+1} := C + \{u, v\} - \{u, u'\}$; $k := k + 1$;

goto L1 {cycle extetion}

end

end else

begin

$t := t + 1$; $Q_t := \text{ROTATE}(Q_s, \{w_i, x_j\})$; $\bar{\delta}(Q_t) := \bar{\delta}(Q_s) + 1$

end

end for{next j}

end for{next i}

$s := s + 1$;

until $\bar{\delta}(Q_s) \geq 2T + 1$ {where $T = \lceil \ln n/(\ln d - \ln \ln d) \rceil + 1$}

terminate unsuccessfully

end

end

Figure 1: Algorithm HAM from [6]

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ be a random intersection graph with $\ln n = o(m)$, then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Pr\left\{\{\delta(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)) \geq 2\} \cap \{\textit{HAM terminates unsuccessfully on } \mathcal{G}(n,m,p)\}\right\} = 0.$$

Remark 1. Using the same arguments as in [6], we may show that with high probability the time complexity of HAM on $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ is $O(n^{4+\varepsilon})$ (for any $\varepsilon > 0$).

Theorem 1 together with the probability of the event that the minimum degree of $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ is at least 2, $\delta(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)) \geq 2$, gives the probability of the property that HAM finds a Hamilton cycle in $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$. The proof of Theorem 2 is presented in Appendix A.

Theorem 2. *If $\ln^2 n = o(m)$*

$$p(1-(1-p)^{n-1}) = \frac{\ln n + \ln a_n + c_n}{m},$$

where $c_n = o(\ln n)$, and for some $\varepsilon > 0$

$$a_n = \begin{cases} 1 & \textit{for } m < (1-\varepsilon)\frac{n\ln n}{\ln\ln n}; \\ \frac{np\ln n}{e^{np}-1} & \textit{for } m > (1+\varepsilon)\frac{n\ln n}{\ln\ln n}, \end{cases}$$

then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Pr\left\{\delta(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)) \geq 2\right\} = \begin{cases} 0 & \textit{for } c_n \to -\infty; \\ e^{-e^{-c}} & \textit{for } c_n \to c \in (-\infty,\infty); \\ 1 & \textit{for } c_n \to \infty. \end{cases}$$

In the above mentioned theorem we exclude the case $m = (1+o(1))n\ln n/\ln\ln n$. This case may be analysed by the same methods as those presented in the proofs but would require several additional case studies and more cases in the definition of a_n. We omit it for the sake of clarity of presentation. The result may be also expanded to the case $c_n = \Omega(\ln n)$ by a simple coupling and monotonicity of the property $\{\delta(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)) \geq 2\}$.

The remaining part of the article is organized as follows. In Section 3 we introduce some notation and gather facts which will be used repeatedly in the whole article. In the following two sections we present a proof of Theorem 1 in the case $mp^2 \leq 1$ and $m \geq n^{1-\varepsilon}$ for $\varepsilon = 1/25$. Namely, in Section 4 we study the properties of $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$, which are crucial for the analysis of algorithm HAM on $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ and we discuss the notion of deletable sets. In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1 in the case $mp^2 \leq 1$ and $m \geq n^{1-\varepsilon}$ using facts proved in the first part of the article. In Section 6 we explain how to adjust the proof to the case where $m < n^{1-\varepsilon}$ or $mp^2 > 1$.

3 Notation and important facts

For any graph $\mathcal{G}$ we denote by $E(\mathcal{G})$ its edge set. If we mention an intersection graph $\mathcal{G}$ we mean not only the graph but also the underlying structure of feature sets attributed to vertices. For any intersection graph $\mathcal{G}$ with a vertex set $\mathcal{V}$ and feature set $\mathcal{W}$, if $w \in \mathcal{W}(v)$ then we say that the vertex v *chose* feature w and w *was chosen by* v. For $v \in \mathcal{V}$, $w \in \mathcal{W}$, $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, and $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{W}$ we use the following notation

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{G}}(v) = \{w \in \mathcal{W} : v \text{ chose } w\}, \qquad \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{S}) = \bigcup_{v \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{G}}(v);$$

i.e. the set of features chosen by v (and, respectively, chosen by vertices from $\mathcal{S}$);

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(w) = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : w \text{ was chosen by } v\}, \qquad \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{R}) = \bigcup_{w \in \mathcal{R}} \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(w);$$

i.e. the set of vertices which chose w (and, respectively, chose features from $\mathcal{R}$);

$$\mathcal{W}'_{\mathcal{G}}(v) = \{w \in \mathcal{W}(v) : |\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(w)| \geq 2\}, \qquad \mathcal{W}'_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{S}) = \bigcup_{v \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{W}'_{\mathcal{G}}(v);$$

i.e. the set of features chosen by v (and, respectively, chosen by vertices from $\mathcal{S}$) which contribute to at least one edge in $\mathcal{G}$;

$$\mathcal{W}''_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{S}) = \{w \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{S}) : |\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(w) \cap \mathcal{S}| \geq 2\};$$

i.e. the set of features chosen by at least two vertices from $\mathcal{S}$;

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}}(v) = \{v' \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{v\} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{G}}(v) \cap \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{G}}(v') \neq \emptyset\}, \qquad \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{S}) = \bigcup_{v \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}}(v) \setminus \mathcal{S};$$

i.e. the set of neighbours of v in $\mathcal{G}$ (and, respectively, neighbours of $\mathcal{S}$ in $\mathcal{G}$).

In addition we set random variables

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\mathcal{G}}(v) &= |\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{G}}(v)|, & W_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{S}) &= |\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{S})|, \\ V_{\mathcal{G}}(w) &= |\mathcal{V}(w)|, & V_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{R}) &= |\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{R})|, \\ W'_{\mathcal{G}}(v) &= |\mathcal{W}'_{\mathcal{G}}(v)|, & W'_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{S}) &= |\mathcal{W}'_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{S})|, \\ W''_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{S}) &= |\mathcal{W}''_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{S})|, & & \\ N_{\mathcal{G}}(v) &= |\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}}(v)|, & N_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{S}) &= |\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{S})|, \end{aligned}$$

and $\deg(v) = \deg_{\mathcal{G}}(v) = N_{\mathcal{G}}(v)$.

In the above mentioned notation we consequently omit subscript $\mathcal{G}$ when it is clear from the context which intersection graph $\mathcal{G}$ we have in mind.

Alternatively, in order to obtain an instance $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$, we may first construct an instance $\mathcal{B}$ of a random bipartite graph $\mathcal{B}(n,m,p)$ with bipartition $(\mathcal{V},\mathcal{W})$ in which each edge $\{v,w\}$, $v\in\mathcal{V}$ and $w\in\mathcal{W}$, appears independently with probability p. We connect vertices $v\in\mathcal{V}$ and $v'\in\mathcal{V}$ by an edge in $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ if they have a common neighbour in $\mathcal{B}(n,m,p)$. An instance $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ constructed in this manner from $\mathcal{B}$ we will call *associated with* $\mathcal{B}$. Note that $\mathcal{W}(v)$, $v\in\mathcal{V}$ is the set of neighbours of the vertex v in $\mathcal{B}(n,m,p)$. Moreover $\mathcal{V}(w)$ is the set of neighbours of $w\in\mathcal{W}$ in $\mathcal{B}(n,m,p)$. In addition $W(v)$ and $V(w)$ are degrees of $v\in\mathcal{V}$ and $w\in\mathcal{W}$ in $\mathcal{B}(n,m,p)$.

Moreover, let

$$d_0 = mp(1-(1-p)^{n-1}), \qquad d_1 = nmp^2.$$

The following relations between d_0, d_1, and mp will be frequently used without mentioning them directly. In the range of parameters we are interested in (i.e. when probability of the event $\{\delta(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p))\geq 2\}$ does not tend to 0), we have

$$d_0 \geq (1+o(1))\ln n.$$

Moreover by definition

$$\begin{aligned} &d_0 \leq mp,\\ &d_0 \leq nmp^2 = d_1,\\ &d_0 \leq mp\min\{np,1\},\\ &d_1 \leq 2d_0\max\{np,1\}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition,

if $np>40$ then $0.9\,mp\leq d_0\leq mp$ and

if $np\leq 40$ then $d_0\leq d_1\leq 40.1d_0$.

We will frequently use Chernoff's inequality in the following form (see for example Theorem 2.1 in [11]).

Lemma 1. *Let X be a random variable with the binomial distribution and expected value μ, then for any $0<\varepsilon<1$*

$$\Pr\{X\leq\varepsilon\mu\}\leq\exp\left(-\psi(\varepsilon)\mu\right),$$

where

$$\psi(\varepsilon)=\varepsilon\ln\varepsilon+1-\varepsilon.$$

4 Graph properties and deletable sets

In this and the following section we assume that $m \geq n^{1-\varepsilon}$ (for $\varepsilon = 1/25$) and $mp^2 \leq 1$ (i.e. $n \geq d_1$) and we set

$$d = d(n) = nmp^2 = d_1.$$

The efficiency of algorithm HAM on a random graph is due to the fact that random graphs, in general, have good expansion properties. Below we list the properties which will be used in the analysis of algorithm HAM on $\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)$.

Given an intersection graph $\mathcal{G}$ associated with a bipartite graph $\mathcal{B}$, integers $d_0 = d_0(n)$, $d_1 = d_1(n)$, $m = m(n)$, real $p = p(n) \in (0, 1)$, sets SMALL $\subseteq \mathcal{V}$ and LARGE $= \mathcal{V} \setminus$ SMALL, and constant $b_1 > 0$ we define the following properties:

P0 $\delta(\mathcal{G}) \geq 2$;

P1 $|\text{SMALL}| \leq n^{1/3}$ and
if $d_0 \geq 2 \ln n$ then $|\text{SMALL}| = \emptyset$;

P2 There are no $v, v' \in$ SMALL at distance 4 or less apart;

P3 For all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq$ LARGE, if $|\mathcal{S}| \leq n/d_1$ then $N(\mathcal{S}) \geq b_1 d_1 |\mathcal{S}|$.

P4 For all $v \in \mathcal{V}$

$$W(v) \leq 4mp, \quad W'(v) \leq 4d_0, \quad N(v) \leq 12d_1.$$

P5 For all $w \in \mathcal{W}$

$$V(w) \leq \frac{\ln n}{\ln \ln n} \max\{np, 4\}.$$

The proof of the following lemma is included in Appendix B.

Lemma 2. *Let $\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)$ be a random intersection graph with $p \leq \sqrt{2 \ln n/m}$, $\ln n = o(m)$, and*

$$d_0 \geq (1 + o(1)) \ln n.$$

Moreover let

$$\mathit{SMALL} = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : W'(v) \leq 0.1 d_0\}, \quad \mathit{LARGE} = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : W'(v) > 0.1 d_0\}.$$

If $m \geq n^{1-\varepsilon}$ ($\varepsilon = 1/25$) then with high probability $\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)$ has properties **P1**–**P5** *with $b_1 = 0.001$.*

It is easy to prove by the first moment method that if $p > \sqrt{2 \ln n/m}$ then with high probability $\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)$ is a complete graph. Therefore if $p > \sqrt{2 \ln n/m}$ then with high probability HAM finds a Hamilton cycle in $\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)$ without any problem. This is why we may restrict ourselves to the case $p \leq \sqrt{2 \ln n/m}$.

In the analysis of HAM we will use some additional notation. In most cases it is consistent with [6]. If HAM terminates unsuccessfully on stage k then

$\mathcal{H}(G)$ is the set o edges of paths $P^{(1)}, \ldots, P^{(M)}$ and edges $\{u_0, u_1\}$, where:

- $P_1 = P^{(1)}, \ldots, P^{(M)} = P_k$ is the sequence of paths constructed by HAM, where $P^{(i+1)}$ is obtained from $P^{(i)}$ by a simple extension, cycle extension, or rotation and
- $\{u_0, u_1\}$ are endpoints of the paths on which HAM executes a cycle extension;

$\mathrm{END}(G) = \{v \in \mathcal{V}$: there exists a path Q_s on stage k with v as an endpoint and $\bar{\delta}(Q_s) = t$ for some $1 \leq t \leq T\}$;

and for $x \in \mathrm{END}(G)$

$\mathrm{END}(G, x) = \{v \in \mathcal{V}$: there exists a path Q_s on stage k with v and x as endpoints and $\bar{\delta}(Q_s) = t$ for some $1 \leq t \leq 2T\}$;

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be such that HAM terminates unsuccessfully on $\mathcal{G}$. Given a constant $b_2 > 0$, we call $X \subseteq E(\mathcal{G})$ *deletable with* b_2 if

D1 no edge of X is incident to a vertex from SMALL;

D2 for any $v \in$ LARGE there are at most $b_2 d$ edges from X incident to v;

D3 $X \cap \mathcal{H}(G) = \emptyset$.

From the description of the algorithm it follows that

$$|\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{G})| \leq n(2T + 2), \tag{1}$$

where T is defined as in the algorithm, i.e. $T = o(\ln n)$.

Following the lines of the proof of Lemma 3.2 from [6] one may show the following lemma (see the proof in Appendix C).

Lemma 3. *Suppose that HAM terminates unsuccessfully in stage k on $\mathcal{G}$. Let b_3 ($b_3 > 0$) and b_4 ($0 \leq b_4 < \min\{b_3, 1/3\}$) be constants and $\delta_0 = \max\{1, b_4 \min\{\delta(\mathcal{G}'), d\}\}$. Moreover let $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be such that for n large*

(i) $\delta(\mathcal{G}') \geq 2$;

(ii) There exists set $\mathcal{V}' \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ such that:

- *for every v there are at most δ_0 vertices form $\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}'$ at distance at most 2 from v;*
- *for all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{V}'$, $N_{\mathcal{G}'}(\mathcal{S}) \geq b_3 d$;*

(iii) $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq E(\mathcal{G}')$.

Then HAM terminates unsuccessfully in stage k on $\mathcal{G}'$ and for any constant $b_5 < (b_3 - b_4)/2$ and n large

$$|END(\mathcal{G}')| \geq b_5 n;$$
$$|END(\mathcal{G}', x)| \geq b_5 n, \quad \textit{for any } x \in END(\mathcal{G}').$$

Remark 2. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an instance of $\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)$ with properties **P0**–**P5** and let $d = d_1$. Moreover let X be deletable with $b_2 < b_1$ in $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{V}, E(\mathcal{G}) \setminus X)$, and let $\mathcal{V}' = \text{LARGE}$. Then **P0**, **P3**, **D1**, and **D2** imply (i) for n large. Moreover, **D3** implies (iii), and **D1**, **D2**, **P2**, and **P3** imply (ii) with $b_4 = 0$ and $b_3 < b_1 - b_2$.

Assume that we have an instance $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{B}(n, m, p)$ and intersection graph $\mathcal{G}$ associated with $\mathcal{B}$. Denote by $\mathcal{B}_q$ a random subgraph of $\mathcal{B}$ obtained by deleting each edge of $\mathcal{B}$ independently with probability $q = \lambda/n$, where λ is a positive constant. Moreover let $\mathcal{G}_q$ be a random subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$ associated with $\mathcal{B}_q$. For any $\mathcal{G}$ and its subgraph $\mathcal{G}_q$ let X_q be the set of egdes included in $\mathcal{G}$ but absent in $\mathcal{G}_q$. Consider a probability space in which we first pick $\mathcal{G}$ according to the probability distribution of $\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)$ and then create $\mathcal{G}_q$. The outcome of the experiment is a pair of graphs $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}_q)$. Denote by $\mathcal{G}_q(n, m, p)$ the random graph $\mathcal{G}_q$ constructed in this manner and by $X_q(n, m, p)$ the set X_q. If an edge was present in $\mathcal{G}$ ($\mathcal{B}$, resp.) and is absent in $\mathcal{G}_q$ ($\mathcal{B}_q$, resp) we will say that the edge *was deleted in* $\mathcal{G}_q$ ($\mathcal{B}_q$, resp).

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an intersection graph on n vertices with properties* **P0**–**P5** *such that HAM terminates unsuccessfully on $\mathcal{G}$. Then*

$$\Pr\left\{X_q(n, m, p) \textit{ is deletable with } b_2 = 0.5 b_1 \,\middle|\, \mathcal{G}(n, m, p) = \mathcal{G}\right\} \geq (1 + o(1)) \exp(-2\lambda(2T + 2))$$

where $o(1)$ is uniformly bounded over all possible choices of $\mathcal{G}$.

Proof. Recall that X_q is deletable if it has properties **D1**, **D2**, and **D3**.

Set features in $\mathcal{W}$ in any order $\{w_1, \ldots, w_m\}$. For any edge $\{v, v'\}$ let $w_{vv'}$ be the smallest (in order of $\mathcal{W}$) feature in $\mathcal{V}''(\{v, v'\})$ (incident to both v and v' in $\mathcal{B}$) and for any $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $v' \in \mathcal{N}(v)$ let $w_{\mathcal{W}'(v)v'}$ be the the smallest (in order of $\mathcal{W}$) feature from $\mathcal{W}'(v)$, which is incident to v' in $\mathcal{B}$.

For any $v \in \mathcal{V}$, $v' \in \mathcal{N}(v)$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}'(v)$ define events:

$A_{vv'}$ – event that neither $\{v, w_{vv'}\}$ nor $\{w_{vv'}, v'\}$ was deleted in $\mathcal{B}_q$;

$B_{vv'}$ – event that $\{v', w_{\mathcal{W}'(v)v'}\}$ was deleted in $\mathcal{B}_q$;

C_{vw} – event that $\{v, w\}$ was deleted in $\mathcal{B}_q$.

Consider events

$$A = \bigcap_{v\in\text{SMALL},v'\in\mathcal{N}(v)} A_{vv'} \cap \bigcap_{\{v,v'\}\in\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{G})} A_{vv'},$$
$$B = \bigcup_{v\in\text{LARGE}} \bigcup_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{N}(v),|\mathcal{S}|=0.1b_1d_0} \bigcap_{v'\in\mathcal{S}} B_{vv'},$$
$$C = \bigcup_{v\in\text{LARGE}} \bigcup_{\mathcal{R}\subseteq\mathcal{W}'(v),|\mathcal{R}|=0.1\frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln n}b_1d_0} \bigcap_{w\in\mathcal{R}} C_{vw},$$

and event

$$A \cap (B \cup C)^c = A \cap B^c \cap C^c,$$

where, for any event D, by D^c we denote the complement of event D. First we will prove that if $A \cap B^c \cap C^c$ occurs then X_q is deletable with $b_2 = 0.5b_1 = 0.0005$. $\bigcap_{v,v'\in\text{SMALL}} A_{vv'}$ implies **D1** and $\bigcap_{vv'\in\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{G})} A_{vv'}$ implies **D3**. We are left with showing that $B^c \cap C^c$ implies **D2**.

Let $v \in$ LARGE. Note that if an edge between v and $\mathcal{N}(v)$ is deleted in $\mathcal{G}_q$ then there is a deleted edge in $\mathcal{B}_q$ between $\mathcal{W}'(v)$ and $\mathcal{N}(v)$ or between v and $\mathcal{W}'(v)$.

Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(v)$ be the largest set such that, for all $v' \in \mathcal{S}$, all edges between v' and $\mathcal{W}'(v)$ were deleted in $\mathcal{B}_q$. Event B^c implies that $|\mathcal{S}| \leq 0.1b_1d_0 \leq 0.1b_1d_1$, therefore there are at most $0.1b_1d_1$ edges incident to v deleted in $\mathcal{G}_q$ due to deletions of edges between $\mathcal{W}'(v)$ and $\mathcal{N}(v)$ in $\mathcal{B}_q$.

Let $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{W}'(v)$ be the largest set such that, for all $w \in \mathcal{R}$, $\{v, w\}$ was deleted in $\mathcal{B}_q$. Event C^c implies that $|\mathcal{R}| \leq 0.1\frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln n}b_1d_0$. Property **P5** implies that

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathcal{R}) &\leq |\mathcal{R}|\frac{\ln n}{\ln\ln n}\max\{np, 4\} \\ &\leq 0.1\frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln n}b_1d_0\frac{\ln n}{\ln\ln n}\max\{np, 4\} \\ &\leq 0.4b_1d_0\max\{np, 1\} \leq 0.4b_1mp\min\{np, 1\}\max\{np, 1\} = 0.4b_1d_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore there are at most $0.4b_1d_1$ edges between v and $\mathcal{N}(v)$ deleted in $\mathcal{G}_q$ due to deletions of edges between v and $\mathcal{W}'(v)$ in $\mathcal{B}_q$.

In conclusion, $B^c \cap C^c$ and **P5** imply that for any vertex $v \in$ LARGE there are at most $0.5b_1d_1$ edges incident to v in X_q.

Now we will bound the probability that, given $\mathcal{G}$ with properties **P0**–**P5**, $A\cap(B\cup C)^c$, occurs. Let $\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{\cdot\} = \Pr\{\cdot \mid \mathcal{G}(n, m, p) = \mathcal{G}\}$.

In what follows we will use the fact that edges in $\mathcal{B}_q$ are deleted independently. Moreover, if we know that some set of edges of $\mathcal{B}$, say E, was not deleted in $\mathcal{B}_q$, than for any other set of edges E' of $\mathcal{B}$ (possibly intersecting with E) the probability that all edges form E' were not deleted (were deleted, resp.) is at least $(1-2q)^{|E'|}$ (at most $(2q)^{|E'|}$, resp.).

Now we will bound the number of edges incident to vertices from SMALL. If $m \geq n^{1-\varepsilon}$ and $d_0 \leq 2\ln n$ then $d_1 = O(n^{\varepsilon}\ln^2 n)$ (see discussion in the proof of **P2** in Appendix B). Therefore properties **P1** and **P4** imply that there are at most

$$|\mathrm{SMALL}| \cdot 12d_1 = O(n^{1/3}n^{1/25}\ln^2 n) = o(n)$$

edges in $\mathcal{G}$ incident to vertices from SMALL. In addition, by (1), $|\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{G})| \leq n(2T+2)$. Therefore

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{A\} \geq (1-2q)^{o(n)} \cdot (1-2q)^{|\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{G})|} = (1-o(1))\exp(-2\lambda(2T+2)).$$

Moreover by **P4** and the fact that $p \leq \sqrt{2\ln n/m} = o(1)$

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{B|A\} &\leq \sum_{v\in\mathrm{LARGE}} \sum_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{N}(v),|\mathcal{S}|=0.1b_1d_0} \Pr\left\{\bigcap_{v'\in\mathcal{S}} B_{vv'} \,\middle|\, A\right\} \\ &\leq n\binom{12d_1}{0.1b_1d_0}q^{0.1b_1d_0} = n\left(\frac{12e}{0.1b_1}\cdot 2\max\{np,1\}\cdot\frac{\lambda}{n}\right)^{0.1b_1d_0} \\ &\leq n\left(O(1)\max\{p,n^{-1}\}\right)^{0.1b_1(1+o(1))\ln n} = o(1).\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{C|A\} &\leq \sum_{v\in\mathrm{LARGE}} \sum_{\mathcal{R}\subseteq\mathcal{W}'(v),|\mathcal{R}|=0.1b_1\frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln n}d_0} \Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\left\{\bigcap_{w\in\mathcal{R}} C_{vw} \,\middle|\, A\right\} \\ &\leq n\binom{4d_0}{0.1b_1\frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln n}d_0}q^{0.1b_1\frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln n}d_0} \\ &\leq n\left(\frac{e4}{0.1b_1}\cdot\frac{\ln n}{\ln\ln n}\cdot\frac{\lambda}{n}\right)^{0.1b_1\frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln n}d_0} = o(1).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, given an instance $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ with properties **P0**–**P5** we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{A\cap(B\cup C)^c\} &= \Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{A\}(1-\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{B\cup C|A\}) \\ &\geq \Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{A\}(1-\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{B|A\}-\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{C|A\}) \geq (1+o(1))\exp(-2\lambda(2T+2)),\end{aligned}$$

where $o(1)$ is uniformly bounded over all possible choices of $\mathcal{G}$ with properties **P0**–**P5**. □

5 Probability of HAM terminating unsuccessfully

Recall that we consider pairs $(\mathcal{G},\mathcal{G}_q)$, where $\mathcal{G}$ is chosen according to the probability distribution of $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ and $\mathcal{G}_q$ is a random subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$. For a pair $(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p),\mathcal{G}_q(n,m,p))$ constructed in this manner define events

D_1 – $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ has properties **P1**–**P5** with $b_1 = 1/1000$;

D_2 – $\delta(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)) \geq 2$ (property **P0**);

D_3 – HAM terminates unsuccessfully on $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$;

E_1 – HAM terminates unsuccessfully on $\mathcal{G}_q(n,m,p)$;

E_2 – there is no edge $\{v,v'\} \in X_q(n,m,p)$ such that $v \in \mathrm{END}(\mathcal{G}_q(n,m,p))$ and $v' \in \mathrm{END}(\mathcal{G}_q(n,m,p),v)$;

E_3 – $|\mathrm{END}(\mathcal{G}_q(n,m,p))| \geq n/5000$ and $|\mathrm{END}(\mathcal{G}_q(n,m,p),v)| \geq n/5000$, for all $v \in \mathrm{END}(\mathcal{G}_q(n,m,p))$.

Let moreover

$$D = D_1 \cap D_2 \cap D_3 \quad \text{and} \quad E = E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3.$$

Note that by Lemma 3 and Remark 2, D and the event that $X_q(n,m,p)$ is deletable with $b_2 = 0.5b_1 = 1/2000$ imply event E. Therefore by Lemma 4

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{D \cap E\} &\geq \Pr\{E|D\} \Pr\{D\} \\ &\geq \Pr\{X_q(n,m,p) \text{ is deletable with } b_2 = 0.5b_1 | D\} \Pr\{D\} \\ &\geq (1-o(1)) \exp(-2\lambda(2T+2)) \Pr\{D\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Now we will find an upper bound of the probability $\Pr\{D \cap E\}$. Note that $\mathcal{G}_q(n,m,p)$ is distributed as $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p')$ associated with $\mathcal{B}(n,m,p')$, where $p' = p(1-q)$. We will focus on event E_2, given that E_1 and E_3 occurred. We will start with proving that with high probability sets $\mathcal{W}(\mathrm{END}(\cdot)) = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{G}(n,m,p')}(\mathrm{END}(\cdot))$ are large.

First we bound the probability that in $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p')$ there exists a set $\mathcal{S}$ of $n/5000$ vertices such that $W(\mathcal{S}) = W_{\mathcal{G}(n,m,p')}(\mathcal{S}) \leq 0.3m \min\{np'/5000, 1\}$. Define event

$$F \text{ - } \forall_{\mathcal{S},|\mathcal{S}|=n/5000}\ W(\mathcal{S}) \geq 0.3m \min\left\{\tfrac{np'}{5000}, 1\right\} \text{ in } \mathcal{G}(n,m,p').$$

First assume that $n \leq m$. Recall that if $|\mathcal{S}| = n/5000$ then $W(\mathcal{S})$ has binomial distribution $\mathrm{Bin}\left(m, 1-(1-p')^{n/5000}\right)$ and $1-(1-p')^{n/5000} \geq 0.5 \min\{np'/5000, 1\}$. As $mp' \geq (1+o(1)) \ln n$ and $n \leq m$

$$\mathbb{E}W(\mathcal{S}) \geq 0.5m \min\left\{\frac{np'}{5000}, 1\right\} \geq \frac{n}{5000} 0.5 \min\left\{mp', \frac{5000m}{n}\right\} \geq \frac{n}{5000} \cdot 2500.$$

Therefore, if $n \leq m$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\{F^c\} &= \Pr\left\{\exists_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{W},|\mathcal{S}|=\frac{n}{5000}} W(\mathcal{S}) \leq 0.3m \min\left\{\frac{np'}{5000}, 1\right\}\right\} \\ &\leq \binom{n}{n/5000} \exp\left(-\psi\left(0.6\right) 0.5m \min\left\{\frac{np'}{5000}, 1\right\}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{n}{5000}\left(1 + \ln 5000 - \psi(0.6)\cdot 2500\right)\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{n}{5000}\left(1 + \ln 5000 - 233\right)\right) \leq \exp(-0.04n).\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Now assume that $n \geq m$. Then $np' \geq (n/m)mp' \geq (1+o(1))\ln n$, therefore, for n large, $0.3m \min\left\{\frac{np'}{5000}, 1\right\} = 0.3m$. Let

$$V'' = |\{v \in \mathcal{V} : W(v) \leq 0.1mp'\}|.$$

Note that $\Pr\{W(v) \leq 0.1mp'\} \leq \exp(-\psi(0.1)mp') \leq n^{-2/3}$ and $W(v)$, $v \in \mathcal{V}$, are independent. V'' is therefore stochastically dominated by a random variable with the binomial distribution $\mathrm{Bin}\left(n, n^{-2/3}\right)$. In addition, given $W(v) = t \geq 0.1mp'$, the set $\mathcal{W}(v)$ is distributed uniformly over all subsets of $\mathcal{W}$ of cardinality t (independently of all other vertices from $\mathcal{V}$). Thus, for $n \geq m$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\{F^c\} &\leq \Pr\left\{F^c | V'' \leq n^{1/2}\right\} + \Pr\left\{V'' \geq n^{1/2}\right\} \\ &\leq \binom{n}{\frac{n}{5000}}\binom{m}{0.3m}\left(\frac{0.3m}{m}\right)^{\left(\frac{n}{5000}-n^{1/2}\right)\cdot 0.1mp'} + \binom{n}{n^{1/2}}(n^{-2/3})^{n^{1/2}} \\ &\leq (e5000)^{\frac{n}{5000}}\left(\frac{e}{0.3}\right)^{0.3m} 0.3^{(1+o(1))\frac{n}{5000}mp'} + \left(en^{1/2}n^{-2/3}\right)^{n^{1/2}} \\ &\leq \exp(-n^{1/2})\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{G}'$ be an instance of $\mathcal{G}_q(n,m,p)$ associated with $\mathcal{B}'$ (equivalently, let $\mathcal{G}'$ an instance of $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p')$ associated with $\mathcal{B}'$). Note that given $\mathcal{B}'$, in a pair $(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p), \mathcal{G}_q(n,m,p))$, $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ is distributed as a random intersection graph associated with

$$\mathcal{B}' \cup \mathcal{B}(n,m,q'),$$

where $\mathcal{B}(n,m,q')$ is independent of $\mathcal{B}'$ and $q' = pq/(1-p-pq) = (1+o(1))pq$ (recall that we assume $\ln n = o(m)$ i.e. $p \leq \sqrt{2\ln n/m} = o(1)$). If E_2 occurs then in $\mathcal{B}(n,m,q')$ for

all $v \in \mathrm{END}(\mathcal{G}')$ there is no edge between $\mathcal{W}(\mathrm{END}(\mathcal{G}', v))$ and v, therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\{E_2|E_1 \cap E_3 \cap F\} &\leq \prod_{v \in \mathrm{END}(\mathcal{G}')} (1-q')^{W(\mathrm{END}(\mathcal{G}', v))} \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{n}{5000} \cdot (1+o(1))p \cdot \frac{\lambda}{n} \cdot 0.3m \min\left\{\frac{np'}{5000}, 1\right\}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-(1+o(1))\lambda \cdot \frac{3}{50000} \cdot \min\left\{\frac{d_1}{5000}, mp\right\}\right) \\ &\leq \exp(-\lambda' \ln n)\end{aligned}$$

for $\lambda' = \lambda \cdot 10^{-8}$.

Therefore by (3) and the above calculation

$$\Pr\{D \cap E\} \leq \Pr\{E_2|E_1 \cap E_3 \cap F\} + \Pr\{F^c\} \leq (1+o(1)) \exp\{-\lambda' \ln n\}.$$

Combining this equation with (2) we get

$$(1-o(1)) \exp(-2\lambda(2T+2)) \Pr\{D\} \leq (1+o(1)) \exp\{-\lambda' \ln n\},$$

i.e.

$$\Pr\{D\} \leq (1+o(1)) \exp\{-\lambda' \ln n + 2\lambda(2T+2)\} = o(1).$$

Therefore by the above equation and Lemma 2

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\{\{\delta(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)) \geq 2\} \cap \{&\text{HAM finishes unsuccessfully on } \mathcal{G}(n,m,p)\}\} \\ &= \Pr\{D_2 \cap D_3\} \leq \Pr\{D_1 \cap D_2 \cap D_3\} + \Pr\{D_1^c\} = o(1).\end{aligned}$$

6 Proof for $m \leq n^{1-\varepsilon}$

We will not give the whole proof in the case $m \leq n^{1-\varepsilon}$ ($\varepsilon = 1/25$) and $mp^2 \leq 1$ as, in its main part, it follows the lines of the proof for $m \geq n^{1-\varepsilon}$. We just note several adjustments that we make.

We leave the definition of d but we redefine SMALL and LARGE.

$$\mathrm{SMALL}_* = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : W'(v) \leq 6 \cdot 10^{-3} mp\}, \quad \mathrm{LARGE}_* = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : W'(v) > 6 \cdot 10^{-3} mp\}.$$

We need to add that in this case

$$np = (n/m)mp \geq (1+o(1))n^{\varepsilon} \ln n \quad \text{and} \quad mp = (1+o(1))d_0. \tag{4}$$

We redefine properties.

P0$_*$ $\delta(\mathcal{G}) \geq np/2 \geq n^{\varepsilon} \ln n/2$;

P1$_*$ $|\mathrm{SMALL}_*| \leq n^{\varepsilon}$ and
if $mp \geq 2 \ln n$ then $|\mathrm{SMALL}_*| = \emptyset$;

P3$_*$ For all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathrm{LARGE}_*$, if $|\mathcal{S}| \leq n/d_1$ then $N(\mathcal{S}) \geq b_1 d_1 |\mathcal{S}|$.

P4 For all $v \in \mathcal{V}$

$$W(v) \leq 4mp, \quad W'(v) \leq 4d_0, \quad N(v) \leq 12d_1.$$

Now we may prove the following analogue of Lemma 2

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)$ be a random intersection graph and*

$$d_0 \geq (1 + o(1)) \ln n.$$

Moreover let

$$SMALL_* = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : W'(v) \leq 6 \cdot 10^{-3} mp\}, \quad LARGE_* = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : W'(v) > 6 \cdot 10^{-3} mp\}.$$

If $m < n^{1-\varepsilon}$ ($\varepsilon = 1/25$) then with high probability $\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)$ has properties **P1**$_*$, **P3**$_*$ *with $b_1 = 0.001$, and* **P4**.

The proof is presented in Appendix B.

Remark 3. While proving Lemma 5 we also show that if $m < n^{1-\varepsilon}$ then

$$\Pr\{\{\delta(\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)) \geq 2\} \cap \{\delta(\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)) \geq np/2\}^c\} = o(1). \tag{5}$$

(see Appendix B).

We also redefine the notion of deletable set. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be such that HAM terminates unsuccessfully on $\mathcal{G}$. Given constant $b_2 > 0$, we call $X \subseteq E(\mathcal{G})$ *deletable with* b_2 if

D1$_*$ for any $v \in \mathrm{SMALL}_*$ there are at most $b_2 d_0$ edges from X incident to v;

D2$_*$ for any $v \in \mathrm{LARGE}_*$ there are at most $b_2 d_1$ edges from X incident to v;

D3 $X \cap \mathcal{H}(G) = \emptyset$.

Now we will show that with the above definition we may give an analogue of Remark 2.

Lemma 6. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an instance of $\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)$ with properties* **P0**$_*$, **P1**$_*$, **P3**$_*$, **P4** *and let X be deletable in $\mathcal{G}$ with a constant $b_2 < b_1$. Then for $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{V}, E(\mathcal{G}) \setminus X)$ assumptions of Lemma 3 with $\mathcal{V}' = LARGE_*$ are fulfilled with any constants $b_4 < b_1 - b_2$ and $b_3 > 0$.*

Proof. Recall that $mp = o(np)$, $d_0 = (1 + o(1))mp$, and $np = o(d_1)$. Therefore By $\mathbf{P0}_*$, $\mathbf{P3}_*$, $\mathbf{D1}_*$, and $\mathbf{D2}_*$

$$\delta(\mathcal{G}') \geq \min\{\delta(\mathcal{G}) - b_2 d_0, (b_1 - b_2)d_1\} \geq (1 + o(1))np/2 \geq (1 + o(1))n^{\varepsilon} \ln n/2.$$

This implies (i).

Now we show the first part of (ii). By the above calculation we have $\min\{\delta(\mathcal{G}'), d_1\} \geq (1 + o(1))n^{\varepsilon} \ln n/2$, therefore by $\mathbf{P0}_*$ and $\mathbf{P1}_*$

$$|\mathrm{SMALL}_*| \leq n^{\varepsilon} = o(\min\{\delta(\mathcal{G}'), d_1\})$$

This implies the first part of (ii) with any constant $b_3 > 0$. The second part of (ii) follows by $\mathbf{P3}_*$ and $\mathbf{D2}_*$. Finally (iii) follows by $\mathbf{D3}$. □

Now we will show an analogue of Lemma 4.

Lemma 7. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an intersection graph on n vertices with properties $\mathbf{P0}_*$, $\mathbf{P1}_*$, $\mathbf{P3}_*$, $\mathbf{P4}$ such that HAM finishes unsuccessfully on $\mathcal{G}$. Then*

$$\Pr\left\{X_q(n,m,p) \text{ is deletable with } b_2 = 0.5b_1 \;\middle|\; \mathcal{G}(n,m,p) = \mathcal{G}\right\} \geq (1 + o(1)) \exp(-2\lambda(2T + 2))$$

where $o(1)$ is uniformly bounded over all possible choices of $\mathcal{G}$.

Proof. We redefine events A and B. For any $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$ let A^*_{vw} be event that $\{v, w\}$ was not deleted in $\mathcal{B}_q$. Moreover

$$A_* = \bigcap_{v \in \mathrm{SMALL}_*, w \in \mathcal{W}(v)} A^*_{vw} \cap \bigcap_{\{v,v'\} \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{G})} A_{vv'},$$

$$B_* = \bigcup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \bigcup_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(v), |\mathcal{S}| = 0.1 b_1 d_0} \bigcap_{v' \in \mathcal{S}} B_{vv'},$$

$$C = \bigcup_{v \in \mathrm{LARGE}} \bigcup_{\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{W}'(v), |\mathcal{R}| = 0.1 \frac{\ln \ln n}{\ln n} b_1 d_0} \bigcap_{w \in \mathcal{R}} C_{vw}.$$

Recall that for $v \in \mathrm{SMALL}_*$, if $mp \leq 2 \ln n$ then we have $W(v) \leq 6 \cdot 10^{-3} mp \leq 12 \cdot 10^{-3} \ln n$. Otherwise by $\mathbf{P1}_*$ $\mathrm{SMALL}_* = \emptyset$. Therefore by $\mathbf{P1}_*$ and (1)

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{A_*\} \geq (1 - q)^{n^{\varepsilon} \cdot 12 \cdot 10^{-3} \ln n} (1 - 2q)^{|\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{G})|} \geq (1 + o(1)) \exp(-2\lambda(2T + 2)).$$

Moreover, similar bounds as for $\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{B|A\}$ and $\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{C|A\}$ in the case $m \geq n^{1-\varepsilon}$ give

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{B_*|A_*\} = o(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\{C|A_*\} = o(1).$$

Therefore

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{G}}\left\{A_* \cap (B_* \cup C)^c\right\} \geq (1+o(1))\exp(-2\lambda(2T+2)).$$

We are left with showing that $A_* \cap (B_* \cup C)^c$ implies that X_q is deletable. The same arguments as before give that A_* implies **D3** and $(B_* \cup C)^c$ imply $\mathbf{D2}_*$. Moreover A_* with B_* imply $\mathbf{D1}_*$. □

In the remaining part of the proof we only replace D_1 and D_2 by

D_{1*} – $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ has properties $\mathbf{P1}_*$, $\mathbf{P3}_*$, **P4** with $b_1 = 1/1000$;

D_{2*} – $\delta(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)) \geq np/2$ (property $\mathbf{P0}_*$);

and at the end, using (5), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\left\{\{\delta(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)) \geq 2\} \cap \{\text{HAM finishes unsuccessfully on } \mathcal{G}(n,m,p)\}\right\}\\
&\leq \Pr\left\{\{\delta(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)) \geq np/2\} \cap \{\text{HAM finishes unsuccessfully on } \mathcal{G}(n,m,p)\}\right\}\\
&\quad + \Pr\left\{\{\delta(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)) \geq 2\} \cap \{\delta(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)) \geq np/2\}^c\right\}\\
&= \Pr\left\{D_{2*} \cap D_3\right\} + o(1)\\
&\leq \Pr\left\{D_{1*} \cap D_{2*} \cap D_3\right\} + \Pr\left\{D_{1*}^c\right\} + o(1) = o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

We are left with discussing the case $mp^2 > 1$. If $mp^2 > 1$ then there exists a simple coupling of $\mathcal{G}(n,m,m^{-1/2})$ and $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$ such that with probability one

$$\mathcal{G}(n,m,m^{-1/2}) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(n,m,p).$$

Therefore (by **P3** or $\mathbf{P3}_*$) with high probability each vertex form LARGE (or LARGE_*) has at least $n/1000$ neighbours. Now it is transparent that this case is easier to analyse than the case $mp^2 \leq 1$ and may be investigated using a similar reasoning to this presented in previous sections but significantly simplified. We do not include this case for the sake of shortness.

Appendix A

Proof of Theorem 2. The following result is a special case of Lemma 5.1 from [16].

Lemma 8. *If* $\ln^2 n = o(m)$ *and*

$$p(1-(1-p)^{n-1}) = \frac{\ln n + c_n}{m},$$

then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Pr\left\{\delta(\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)) \geq 1\right\} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } c_n \to -\infty;\\ e^{-e^{-c}} & \text{for } c_n \to c \in (-\infty,\infty);\\ 1 & \text{for } c_n \to \infty. \end{cases}$$

Now we will find the probability of existence of a vertex of degree 1. Recall that

$$p(1-(1-p)^{n-1}) = \frac{\ln n + \ln a_n + c_n}{m},$$

and

$$a_n = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } m < (1-\varepsilon)n\ln n/\ln\ln n; \\ \frac{np\ln n}{e^{np}-1} & \text{for } m > (1+\varepsilon)n\ln n/\ln\ln n. \end{cases}$$

First consider the case $m < (1-\varepsilon)n\ln n/\ln\ln n$. In this case $p(1-(1-p)^{n-1}) = \frac{\ln n + c_n}{m}$ as $a_n = 1$. We will show that if $c_n \to c \in (-\infty, \infty]$ then with high probability there is no vertex of degree 1 in $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$. Note that in this case

$$np \geq np(1-(1-p)^{n-1}) = \frac{n(\ln n + c_n)}{m} > (1+o(1))\frac{\ln\ln n}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

Therefore, for large n, $np > (1+o(1))\ln\ln n/(1-\varepsilon) > (1+\varepsilon)\ln\ln n$, $\ln np = o(np)$, and $mp = (1+o(1))\ln n$.

Note that $v \in \mathcal{V}$ has degree 1 in an intersection graph $\mathcal{G}$ associated with a bipartite graph $\mathcal{B}$ if there exist a feature w and vertex v' such that $\mathcal{V}(w) = \{v, v'\}$ and for any other feature $w' \in \mathcal{W} \setminus \{w\}$ $\{v, w'\}$ is not an edge in $\mathcal{B}$, or w' is adjacent only to v in $\mathcal{B}$, or $\mathcal{V}(w') = \{v, v'\}$. Therefore, for any vertex $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $c_n \to c \in (-\infty, \infty]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\{\deg(v) = 1\} &\leq \sum_{w\in\mathcal{W}}\sum_{v'\in\mathcal{V}} p^2(1-p)^{n-2}((1-p) + p(1-p)^{n-1} + p^2)^{(m-1)} \\
&\leq mp \cdot np \cdot \exp(-np+p) \\
&\quad \cdot \exp\left(-mp(1-(1-p)^{n-1}) + O(mp^2+p)\right) \\
&\leq \exp(\ln mp + \ln np - np - \ln n - c_n + o(1)) \\
&\leq \exp(\ln((1+o(1))\ln n) - (1+o(1))np - \ln n - c_n + o(1)) \\
&\leq \exp(\ln\ln n - (1+\varepsilon)\ln\ln n - \ln n - c_n + o(1)) \\
&= o(n^{-1})
\end{aligned}$$

Thus with high probability there is no vertex of degree 1 in $\mathcal{G}(n,m,p)$. This combined with Lemma 8 complete the proof in this case.

Now assume that $m > (1+\varepsilon)n\ln n/\ln\ln n$. Therefore $np < (mp\ln\ln n)/((1+\varepsilon)\ln n)$ and, as a consequence, $a_n = (np\ln n)/(e^{np}-1) \to \infty$ (note that $x/(e^x-1)$ is decreasing for $x \in (0,\infty)$). Recall that $mp^2 = o(1)$, i.e. also $np^2 = o(1)$. Let k be a constant integer and $\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. Note that $(m)_k$ is the number of choices of $w_1, \ldots, w_k$, which might be chosen by vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_k$, resp., $(n-k)p^2(1-p)^{n-2}$ is the probability that w_i, $1 \leq i \leq k$, was chosen only by v_i and one other vertex from $\mathcal{V} \setminus \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$, and $((1-p)^k + kp(1-p)^{n-1})^{(m-k)}$ is the probability that each feature from $\mathcal{W} \setminus \{w_1, \ldots, w_k\}$

either was not chosen by any vertex from $\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$ or was chosen by exactly one vertex from $\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$ and no other vertex. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\{\deg(v_1) = \ldots = \deg(v_k) = 1\} \\
&\geq (m)_k \left((n-k)p^2(1-p)^{n-2}\right)^k \left((1-p)^k + kp(1-p)^{n-1}\right)^{(m-k)} \\
&\geq (1+o(1))(mp(1-(1-p)^{n-1}))^k \left(\frac{np(1-p)^{n-1}}{(1-(1-p)^{n-1})}\right)^k \\
&\quad \cdot (1-kp+kp(1-p)^{n-1})^{(m-k)} \\
&= (1+o(1)) \left(\frac{\ln n \cdot np}{(1-p)^{-(n-1)}-1}\right)^k \\
&\quad \cdot \exp(-kmp(1-(1-p)^{n-1}) + O(mp^2+p)) \\
&= (1+o(1)) \left(\frac{\ln n \cdot np}{e^{np}-1}\right)^k \exp(-k(\ln n + \ln a_n + c_n)) \\
&= (1+o(1)) \left(\frac{e^{-c_n}}{n}\right)^k.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we will find an upper bound for $\Pr\{\deg(v_1) = \ldots = \deg(v_k) = 1\}$. Below we set i, $0 \leq i \leq k/2$, to be the number of edges induced by $\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$ in $\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)$. We note that the probability that for a given feature w set $\mathcal{V}(w)$ is the same as some edge incident to a vertex from $\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$ is upper bounded by kp^2. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\{\deg(v_1) = \ldots = \deg(v_k) = 1\} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^{k/2} (m)_{k-i} (k)_{2i} (np^2(1-p)^{n-2})^{(k-i)} \\
&\quad \cdot ((1-p)^k + kp(1-p)^{n-1} + kp^2)^{(m-k)} \\
&\leq (1-kp+kp(1-p)^{n-1} + (kp)^2 + kp^2)^{(m-k)} \\
&\quad \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{k/2} k^{2i} (mp(1-(1-p)^{n-1}))^{k-i} \left(\frac{np(1-p)^{n-1}}{(1-(1-p)^{n-1})}\right)^{k-i} \\
&= (1+o(1)) \exp\left(-k(\ln n + \ln a_n + c_n)\right) \sum_{i=0}^{k/2} k^{2i} a_n^{k-2i} \\
&= (1+o(1)) \left(\frac{e^{-c_n}}{n}\right)^k.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by the method of moments (see for example Corollary 6.8 in [11]) the number of vertices of degree 1 in $\mathcal{G}(n, m, p)$ tends to a random variable with the Poisson

distribution $\mathrm{Po}\,(e^{-c})$, where $c = \lim_{n\to\infty} c_n$. This combined with Lemma 8 finishes the proof in the second case.

□

Appendix B

Proof of Lemma 2. In proofs we assume that $\ln n = o(m)$. If we make some additional assumptions concerning relation between n and m, we mention it at the beginning of the proof of the considered property. Moreover, we set $b_1 = 0.001$ and $b_1 = 0.05$.
P1 Note that $W'(v)$ has binomial distribution $\mathrm{Bin}\,(m, d_0/m)$. Therefore for $d_0 \geq (1 - o(1))\ln n$ by Chernoff's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}|\mathrm{SMALL}| &\leq n\Pr\{W'(v) \leq 0.1\cdot d_0\}\\ &\leq n\exp\left(-\psi(0.1)\cdot d_0\right)\\ &\leq \exp\left(\ln n - 0.669\ln n\right) = o(n^{1/3})\end{aligned}$$

Thus by Markov's inequality we get that with high probability $|\mathrm{SMALL}| \leq n^{1/3}$. Moreover the same calculation implies that if $d_0 \geq 2\ln n$ then $\mathbb{E}|\mathrm{SMALL}| = o(1)$ i.e. with high probability $\mathrm{SMALL} = \emptyset$.
P2 In the proof of **P2** we assume additionally that $m \geq n^{1-\varepsilon}$ (for $\varepsilon = 1/25$). First recall that if $d_0 \geq 2\ln n$ then with high probability $\mathrm{SMALL} = \emptyset$, i.e. the statement holds trivially.

Now assume that $d_0 \leq 2\ln n$, i.e. either (for $np \leq 40$)

$$d_1 \leq 40.1 d_0 = O(\ln n)$$

or (for $np > 40$)

$$d_1 = \frac{n}{m}(mp)^2 \leq n^{\varepsilon}(1.1d_0)^2 = O(n^{\varepsilon}\ln^2 n).$$

If $v, v' \in \mathrm{SMALL}$ and v, v' are connected by a path of length t, $t \leq 4$, in $\mathcal{G}$ then there exists a path, $vw_1v_1w_2\ldots v_{t-1}w_tv'$ of length $2t$ in $\mathcal{B}$ with which $\mathcal{G}$ is associated. Moreover $\mathcal{W}'(\{v, v'\}) \setminus \{w_1, \ldots, w_t\}$ is of cardinality at most $0.2d_0$. The cardinality of $\mathcal{W}'(\{v, v'\}) \setminus \{w_1, \ldots, w_t\}$ has binomial distribution $\mathrm{Bin}\,(m - t, 2(d_0/m) - p^2)$ with the expected value $\mu = (m-t)(2(d_0/m)-p^2) = (1-o(1))d_0$, i.e. $0.2d_0 = 0.1\cdot(1+o(1))\mu$. Thus the probability that there exists a path of length at most 4 in $\mathcal{G}\,(n, m, p)$ connecting two small vertices is at most.

$$\begin{aligned}n^2\sum_{t=1}^{4} n^{t-1}m^tp^{2t}\exp(-\psi(0.1(1+o(1)))(1+o(1))2d_0)&\\ = O(1)nd_1^4n^{-4/3} = O(n^{-1/3}n^{4\varepsilon}\ln^8 n) = o(1)&\end{aligned}$$

Now we will prove property **P5** as it will be needed in the proof of **P3**.
P5 Let $k = \frac{\ln n}{\ln\ln n}\max\{4, np\}$. Recall that $V(w)$ has binomial distribution $\mathrm{Bin}\,(n,p)$ and $p \le \sqrt{2\ln n/m}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\left\{\exists_{w\in\mathcal{W}} V(w) \ge k\right\} &\le m\binom{n}{k}p^k \\
&\le m\left(\frac{enp}{k}\right)^{k-2}(np)^2 \\
&\le m\exp\left((k-2)\left(1+\ln(np)-\ln\frac{\ln n}{\ln\ln n}-\ln\max\{4,np\}\right)\right) \\
&\quad\cdot n^2\frac{2\ln n}{m} \\
&\le n^{-3}\cdot n^2\cdot 2\ln n = o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

P3 The structure of $\mathcal{G}\,(n,m,p)$ differs a lot depending on the value np. Therefore we will need to divide the proof into cases:

$$np \le 40 \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{S}| \le \frac{n}{d_1^4}; \tag{6}$$

$$np \le 40 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{n}{d_1^4} \le |\mathcal{S}| \le \frac{n}{d_1}; \tag{7}$$

$$np > 40. \tag{8}$$

First assume that (6) is fulfilled. We will first prove that in this case with high probability for any $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, if $\mathcal{K} \le n/d_1^3$ we have $W''(\mathcal{K}) \le 2|\mathcal{K}|$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\left\{\exists_{\mathcal{K}\subseteq\mathcal{V},|\mathcal{K}|\le n/d_1^3} W''(\mathcal{K}) \ge 2|\mathcal{K}|\right\} &\le \sum_{k=2}^{n/d_1^3}\binom{n}{k}\binom{m}{2k}\left[\binom{k}{2}p^2\right]^{2k} \\
&\le \sum_{k=2}^{n/d_1^3}\left[\frac{en}{k}\cdot\frac{e^2m^2}{2^2k^2}\cdot\frac{k^4}{4}p^4\right]^k \\
&\le \sum_{k=2}^{n/d_1^3}\left[\frac{e^3}{16}\cdot\frac{k}{n}(nmp^2)^2\right]^k \\
&\le \sum_{k=2}^{n/d_1^3}\left(\frac{e^3}{16}\cdot\frac{1}{d_1}\right)^k = o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover if $np \le 40$, and **P5** is fulfilled, then

$$\forall_{w\in\mathcal{W}} V(w) \le \frac{\ln n}{\ln\ln n}\max\{4,np\} \le \frac{40\ln n}{\ln\ln n}. \tag{9}$$

Assume that $\mathcal{G}$ is an intersection graph such that (9) and

$$\forall_{\mathcal{K}\subseteq\mathcal{V},|\mathcal{K}|\leq n/d^3} W''(\mathcal{K}) \leq 2|\mathcal{K}|, \tag{10}$$

are fulfilled. In $\mathcal{G}$, let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \text{LARGE}$ be such that $|\mathcal{S}| \leq n/d_1^4$. We will find a lower bound for $W'(\mathcal{S})$. In $\mathcal{G}$ associated with $\mathcal{B}$ $W'(\mathcal{S})$ is at least the number of edges in $\mathcal{B}$ between $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{W}'(\mathcal{S}) \setminus \mathcal{W}''(\mathcal{S})$. There are $\sum_{v\in\mathcal{S}} W'(v)$ edges between $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{W}'(\mathcal{S})$ in $\mathcal{B}$ and at most $\sum_{w\in W''(\mathcal{S})} V(w)$ of them are incident to some vertes from $\mathcal{W}''(\mathcal{S})$, therefore by (9) and (10)

$$\begin{aligned} W'(\mathcal{S}) &\geq \sum_{v\in\mathcal{S}} W'(v) - \sum_{w\in W''(\mathcal{S})} V(w) \\ &\geq 0.1d_0|\mathcal{S}| - 2|\mathcal{S}|\frac{40\ln n}{\ln\ln n} \geq 0.1(1-o(1))d_0|\mathcal{S}|. \end{aligned}$$

Set $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S})$. Assume that $N(\mathcal{S}) \leq b_1 d_1 |\mathcal{S}|$. Then, as $\mathcal{W}'(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{W}''(\mathcal{K})$,

$$\begin{aligned} W'(\mathcal{S}) \leq W''(\mathcal{K}) &\leq 2|\mathcal{K}| \leq 2(|\mathcal{S}| + b_1 d_1 |\mathcal{S}|) \\ &\leq 2(1 + b_1 \cdot 41 \cdot d_0)|\mathcal{S}| = 82(1+o(1))b_1 d_0 |\mathcal{S}|. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above inequalities we get

$$0.1(1-o(1))d_0|\mathcal{S}| \leq 82(1+o(1))b_1 d_0 |\mathcal{S}|.$$

Thus

$$\frac{1}{1000} = b_1 \geq (1+o(1))\frac{1}{820},$$

a contradiction. Therefore in case (6) we have with high probability

$$N(\mathcal{S}) \geq b_1 d_1 |\mathcal{S}|.$$

Now assume that (7) is fulfilled. Note that $W(\mathcal{S})$, $|\mathcal{S}| = s$, has binomial distribution $\text{Bin}\,(m, 1-(1-p)^s)$. Therefore, for large n, $W(\mathcal{S})$ stochastically dominates a random variable X_s with the binomial distribution $\text{Bin}\,(m, sp(1-sp))$ (recall that $sp \leq np/d_1 = 1/mp = o(1)$). Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\mathcal{S}, n/d_1^4 \le |\mathcal{S}| \le n/d_1} \Pr\left\{W(\mathcal{S}) < 0.05|\mathcal{S}|mp\right\} \\
&\qquad \le \sum_{s=n/d_1^4}^{n/d_1} \binom{n}{s} \Pr\left\{X_s < 0.05smp\right\} \\
&\qquad \le \sum_{s=n/d_1^4}^{n/d_1} \left(ed_1^4\right)^s \exp\left(-\psi\left(\frac{0.05}{1-sp}\right) smp(1-sp)\right) \\
&\qquad \le \sum_{s=n/d_1^4}^{n/d_1} \exp\left(s\left(1 + 4\ln(mp) + 4\ln(np) - 0.8mp\right)\right) = o(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{11}
$$

Now we will show a similar bound in the case where (8) is fulfilled. In this case, if $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \text{LARGE}$, $|\mathcal{S}| = s$, then for all $v \in \mathcal{S}$

$$W(v) \ge W'(v) \ge 0.1d_0 \ge 0.09mp.$$

Moreover, given $W(v)$, the set $\mathcal{W}(v)$ is uniformly distributed among all subsets of $\mathcal{W}$ of cardinality $W(v)$. Therefore the probability that $W(\mathcal{S})$ is at most than $0.05smp$ is at most

$$\binom{m}{0.05smp}\left(\frac{0.05smp}{m}\right)^{0.09smp} = \left(e^{1.25} \cdot 0.05 \cdot sp\right)^{0.04smp}.$$

Recall that $sp \le np/d_1 = 1/mp = o(1)$. Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \text{LARGE}, |\mathcal{S}| \le n/d_1} \Pr\left\{W(\mathcal{S}) \le 0.05|\mathcal{S}|mp\right\} \\
&\qquad \le \sum_{s=1}^{n/d_1} \binom{n}{s} \left(e^{1.25} \cdot 0.05 \cdot sp\right)^{0.04smp} \\
&\qquad \le \sum_{s=1}^{n/d_1} \exp\left(s\left(\ln n + 0.04mp(1.25 + \ln 0.05 + \ln sp)\right)\right) = o(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{12}
$$

Now we will find a bound of the probability that $N(\mathcal{S})$ is smaller than $b_1|\mathcal{S}|d_1$ with $b_1 = 0.001$. In both cases, (7) and (8), the proof is similar.

Given the value $W(\mathcal{S})$, $N(\mathcal{S})$ has binomial distribution $\text{Bin}\left(n - |\mathcal{S}|, 1 - (1-p)^{W(\mathcal{S})}\right)$. If $W(\mathcal{S}) \ge 0.05|\mathcal{S}|mp$ then, for large n, $N(\mathcal{S})$ stochastically dominates a random variable

with binomial distribution $\mathrm{Bin}\left(n - \frac{n}{d_1}, 0.04|\mathcal{S}|mp^2\right)$ (note that $smp^2 \leq 1$). Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\left\{N(\mathcal{S}) \leq 0.001|\mathcal{S}|d_1\right\} \\
&\leq \Pr\left\{N(\mathcal{S}) \leq 0.001|\mathcal{S}|d_1 \,\middle|\, W(\mathcal{S}) \geq 0.05|\mathcal{S}|mp\right\} + \Pr\left\{W(\mathcal{S}) \geq 0.05|\mathcal{S}|mp\right\} \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\psi\left(\frac{0.025}{1-d_1^{-1}}\right)(1-d_1^{-1})0.04|\mathcal{S}|nmp^2\right) + \Pr\left\{W(\mathcal{S}) \geq 0.05|\mathcal{S}|mp\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $|\mathcal{S}| \geq n/d_1^4$

$$\psi\left(\frac{0.025}{1-d_1^{-1}}\right)(1-d_1^{-1})0.04d_1 \geq 0.03d_1.$$

For $np > 40$

$$\psi\left(\frac{0.025}{1-d_1^{-1}}\right)(1-d_1^{-1})0.04nmp^2 > 1.4mp > 1.4 \cdot 0.9 \ln n > 1.2 \ln n.$$

Thus finally in case (7), using (11), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\left\{\exists_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq \mathrm{LARGE}, |\mathcal{S}|\leq n/d_1} N(\mathcal{S}) \leq 0.005|\mathcal{S}|d_1\right\} \\
&\leq \sum_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq \mathrm{LARGE}, |\mathcal{S}|\leq n/d_1} \Pr\left\{N(\mathcal{S}) \leq 0.001|\mathcal{S}|d_1\right\} \\
&\leq \sum_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq \mathrm{LARGE}, |\mathcal{S}|\leq n/d_1} \Pr\left\{N(\mathcal{S}) \leq 0.001|\mathcal{S}|d_1 \,\middle|\, W(\mathcal{S}) \geq 0.05|\mathcal{S}|mp\right\} \\
&\quad + \sum_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq \mathrm{LARGE}, |\mathcal{S}|\leq n/d_1} \Pr\left\{W(\mathcal{S}) \geq 0.05|\mathcal{S}|mp\right\} \\
&\leq \sum_{s=n/d_1^4}^{n/d_1} \binom{n}{s} \exp\left(-0.3sd_1\right) + o(1) \\
&\leq \sum_{s=n/d_1^4}^{n/d_1} \exp\left(s\left(1 + \ln\frac{n}{s} - 0.3d_1\right)\right) + o(1) \\
&\leq \sum_{s=n/d_1^4}^{n/d_1} \exp\left(s\left(1 + 4\ln d_1 - 0.3d_1\right)\right) + o(1) = o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly in case (8), using (12),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\left\{\exists_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq \mathrm{LARGE}, |\mathcal{S}|\leq n/d_1} N(\mathcal{S}) \leq 0.001|\mathcal{S}|d_1\right\}\\
&\leq \sum_{s=1}^{n/d_1} \binom{n}{s} \exp\left(-1.2s\ln n\right) + o(1)\\
&\leq \sum_{s=1}^{n/d_1} \exp\left(s\left(\ln n - 1.2\ln n\right)\right) + o(1) = o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we get that in all cases with high probability

$$\forall_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq \mathrm{LARGE}, |\mathcal{S}|\leq n/d_1} N(\mathcal{S}) \geq 0.001|\mathcal{S}|.$$

P4 $W(v)$ and $W'(v)$ have binomial distribution $\mathrm{Bin}\,(m,p)$ and $\mathrm{Bin}\,(m,d_0/m)$, resp.. Moreover, given $W(v)\leq 4mp$, $N(v)$ is stochastically dominated by a binomial random variable with the binomial distribution $\mathrm{Bin}\,(n,4d_1/n)$ (as $1-(1-p)^{W(v)} \leq 1-(1-p)^{4mp} \leq 4mp^2$). We will show the statement only for $N(v)$. The proofs of the remaining statements are similar. Having in mind that $d_1 \geq d_0 \geq (1+o(1))\ln n$ and $mp \geq d_0 \geq (1+o(1))\ln n$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\left\{\exists_{v\in\mathcal{V}} N(v) \geq 12d_1\right\} &\leq n\left(\Pr\left\{N(v)\geq 12d_1 \,|\, W(v)\leq 4mp\right\} + \Pr\left\{W(v)\geq 4mp\right\}\right)\\
&\leq n\binom{n}{12d_1}\left(\frac{4d_1}{n}\right)^{12d_1} + n\binom{m}{4mp}p^{4mp}\\
&\leq n\left(\frac{e}{3}\right)^{12d_1} + n\left(\frac{e}{4}\right)^{4mp}\\
&\leq \exp(\ln n + 12(1-\ln 3)d_1) + \exp(\ln n + 4(1-\ln 4)mp) = o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 5. We first prove a general statement that with high probability

$$\forall_{\mathcal{R}\subseteq\mathcal{W}, |\mathcal{R}|\leq p^{-1}} V(\mathcal{R}) \geq \frac{np|\mathcal{R}|}{2} + 1. \tag{13}$$

Note that (13) implies that with high probability each vertex is either isolated or of degree at least $np/2$. Therefore (5) follows by (13).

We will now show (13). Recall that $np \geq (1+o(1))n^{\varepsilon}\ln n$. For $\mathcal{R}\subseteq\mathcal{W}$ with $|\mathcal{R}| = r \leq p^{-1}$, $V(\mathcal{R})$ has binomial distribution $\mathrm{Bin}\,(n, 1-(1-p)^r)$ with $\mathbb{E}V(\mathcal{R}) \geq 3npr/5$ (as $1-(1-p)^r \geq 3pr/5$). Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\left\{\exists_{\mathcal{R}\subseteq\mathcal{W}, |\mathcal{R}|\leq p^{-1}} \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{R}) \leq (npr/2)+1\right\} &\leq \sum_{r=1}^{p^{-1}} \binom{m}{r} \exp\left(-\psi((1+o(1)5/6))3npr/5\right)\\
&\leq \sum_{r=1}^{p^{-1}} \exp\left(-r\left(0.008np - \ln m\right)\right) = o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

P1$_*$ This proof is practically the same as the proof of **P1**.
P3$_*$ As in the proof of **P3** in the case $np > 40$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\left\{\exists_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq \mathrm{LARGE}_*, |\mathcal{S}|\le n/d_1} W(\mathcal{S}) \le 3\cdot 10^{-3}\cdot mp|\mathcal{S}|\right\}\\
&\le \sum_{s=1}^{n/d_1} \binom{n}{s}\binom{m}{3\cdot 10^{-3}mps}\left(\frac{3\cdot 10^{-3}mps}{m}\right)^{6\cdot 10^{-3}mps}\\
&\le \sum_{s=1}^{n/d_1} n^s\left(e\cdot 3\cdot 10^{-3}ps\right)^{3\cdot 10^{-3}mps}\\
&\le \sum_{s=1}^{n/d_1} \exp\left(s\left(\ln n + 3\cdot 10^{-3}(1+o(1))\ln n(\ln ps + O(1))\right)\right) = o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

The above stated inequalities together with (13) imply that if $m < n^{1-\varepsilon}$ then with high probability for all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathrm{LARGE}_*$, $|\mathcal{S}| \le n/d_1$, and n large

$$N(\mathcal{S}) = V(\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{S})) - |\mathcal{S}| \ge \frac{np|\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{S})|}{2} - |\mathcal{S}| \ge \frac{np}{2}\cdot 3\cdot 10^{-3}\cdot mp|\mathcal{S}| - |\mathcal{S}| > 10^{-3}d_1|\mathcal{S}|.$$

P4 The proof of **P4** presented in the proof of Lemma 2 is also valid in the case $m < n^{1-\varepsilon}$.
□

Appendix C

Proof of Lemma 3. As $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq E(\mathcal{G}')$, the execution of HAM on $\mathcal{G}'$ will be the same as on $\mathcal{G}$, i.e. HAM will start stage k in $\mathcal{G}'$ with P_k (with endpoints v_0 and v_1) and terminate unsuccessfully in this stage.

Let

$$S_t = \{v : v \in \mathcal{V}' \text{ and there exists a path } Q_s \text{ with endpoints } v_0, v \text{ such that } \bar{\delta}(Q_s) = t\}$$

First we prove that, for n large, $\mathcal{S}_1 \neq \emptyset$. $P_k = Q_1$. If $v_1 \notin \mathcal{V}'$ then v_1 has at least $\delta(\mathcal{G}')$ neighbours on Q_1 and at least $\delta(\mathcal{G}') - 1$ of them are not connected with v_1 by an edge of Q_1. Therefore on Q_1 there are at least $\delta(\mathcal{G}') - 1 \ge 1$ new ends obtained by one rotation from Q_1. If $\delta_0 = 1$ then all of these ends are in $\mathcal{V}'$ (otherwise there would be a vertex with more than $\delta_0 = 1$ neighbour in $\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}'$). This implies $\mathcal{S}_1 \neq \emptyset$ in the case $\delta_0 = 1$. If $\delta_0 > 1$ (i.e. $\delta(\mathcal{G}') \ge 1/b_4 \ge 3$) then, by (ii), at least

$$(1 - b_4)\delta(\mathcal{G}') - 1 \ge 1/b_4 - 2 \ge 1$$

of the ends of the paths obtained by one rotation from Q_1 are in $\mathcal{V}'$, i.e. $\mathcal{S}_1 \neq \emptyset$. If $v_1 \in \mathcal{V}'$ then v_1 has at least $b_3 d$ neighbours and at least $b_3 d - 1$ new ends obtained by a rotation

from Q_1. Then, for n large, at least $b_3d - b_4d - 1 \geq (b_3 - b_4)d - 1 \geq 1$ of these ends are in $\mathcal{V}'$, i.e. $\mathcal{S}_1 \neq \emptyset$.

Now assume that $1 \leq |\mathcal{S}_t| \leq n/d$ for some t, $1 \leq t \leq T$.

For each $v \in \mathcal{S}_t$ set a path $Q_{s(v)}$ with endpoints v_0 and v such that $\bar{\delta}(Q_{s(v)}) = t$.

Now look at the pairs (v, u), where u is a neighbour of v in $\mathcal{G}'$, i.e. $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}'}(v)$. For $\{v, u\}$ which is not an edge of $Q_{s(v)}$, denote by $x(v, u)$ the endpoint of $ROTATE(Q_{s(v)}, \{v, u\})$ other than v_0. If $x(v, u) \in \mathcal{V}'$ then $x(v, u) \in \mathcal{S}_{t+1}$.

For any $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}'}(\mathcal{S}_t)$ there are at most 2 vertices $x \in \mathcal{S}_{t+1}$ such that for some $v \in \mathcal{S}_t$ we have $x = x(v, u)$ and $\{x, u\} \in E(P_k)$.

Moreover, for any v there is only one $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}'}(v)$ such that $\{v, u\} \in E(Q_{s(v)})$, at most b_4d vertices $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}'}(v)$ such that $x(v, u) \notin \mathcal{V}'$ and at most t (where $t = \bar{\delta}(Q_{s(v)})$) vertices $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}'}(v)$ such that $\{x, u\} \notin E(P_k)$ (since there are at most t edges on $Q_{s(v)}$ which are not in P_k).

Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{S}_{t+1}| &= |\{x(v, u) : v \in \mathcal{S}_t, u \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}'}(v) \text{ and } x(v, u) \in \mathcal{V}'\}| \\
&\geq |\{x(v, u) : v \in \mathcal{S}_t, u \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}'}(v), x(v, u) \in \mathcal{V}', \{u, v\} \notin E(Q_{s(v)}), \{x(v, u), u\} \in E(P_k)\}| \\
&\geq |\{u \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{G}'}(\mathcal{S}_t) : \exists_{v \in \mathcal{S}_t} x(v, u) \in \mathcal{V}', \{u, v\} \notin E(Q_{s(v)}), \{x(v, u), u\} \in E(P_k)\}|/2 \\
&\geq (N_{\mathcal{G}'}(\mathcal{S}_t) - (t + 1 + b_4d)|\mathcal{S}_t|)/2 \\
&\geq ((b_3 - b_4)d - T - 1)|\mathcal{S}_t|/2 \\
&= (1 + o(1))(b_3 - b_4)d|\mathcal{S}_t|/2 \geq b_5d|\mathcal{S}_t|
\end{aligned}
$$

for any constant $b_5 < (b_3 - b_4)/2$.

$\mathcal{S}_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $|\mathcal{S}_{t+1}| \geq b_5d|\mathcal{S}_t|$, therefore for some $\tau \leq T-1$ we have $|\mathcal{S}_\tau| \geq n/d$. Applying the same argument as in above calculations for any $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\tau$ such that $|\mathcal{S}'| = n/d$ we have that $\mathcal{S}_{\tau+1} \geq b_5d|\mathcal{S}'| \geq b_5n$. To prove the second part of the lemma, for any $x \in \mathrm{END}(\mathcal{G}')$, it remains to apply the same arguments replacing v_0 by x and P_k by the path Q_σ with one endpoint x and $\bar{\delta}(Q_\sigma) \leq T$. □

References

[1] M. Bloznelis. Degree and clustering coefficient in sparse random intersection graphs. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 23(3):1254–1289, 06 2013.

[2] M. Bloznelis, E. Godehardt, J. Jaworski, V. Kurauskas, and K. Rybarczyk. Recent progress in complex network analysis: Models of random intersection graphs. In Berthold Lausen, Sabine Krolak-Schwerdt, and Matthias Böhmer, editors, *Data Science, Learning by Latent Structures, and Knowledge Discovery*, Studies in Classification, Data Analysis, and Knowledge Organization, pages 69–78. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015.

[3] M. Bloznelis, E. Godehardt, J. Jaworski, V. Kurauskas, and K. Rybarczyk. Recent progress in complex network analysis: Properties of random intersection graphs. In Berthold Lausen, Sabine Krolak-Schwerdt, and Matthias Böhmer, editors, *Data Science, Learning by Latent Structures, and Knowledge Discovery*, Studies in Classification, Data Analysis, and Knowledge Organization, pages 79–88. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015.

[4] M. Bloznelis, J. Jaworski, and K. Rybarczyk. Component evolution in a secure wireless sensor network. *Networks*, 53(1):19–26, 2009.

[5] M. Bloznelis and I. Radavičius. A note on hamiltonicity of uniform random intersection graphs. *Lithuanian Mathematical Journal*, 51(2):155, 2011.

[6] B. Bollobás, T. I. Fenner, and A. M. Frieze. An algorithm for finding hamilton paths and cycles in random graphs. *Combinatorica*, 7(4):327–341, 1987.

[7] T. Brittom, M. Deijfen, A. N. Lagerås, and M. Lindholm. Epidemics on random graphs with tunable clustering. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 45(3):743–756, 2008.

[8] M. Deijfen and W. Kets. Random intersection graphs with tunable degree distribution and clustering. *Probability in the Engineering and Information Sciences*, 23:661–674, 2009.

[9] C. Efthymiou and P. G. Spirakis. On the existence of hamiltonian cycles in random intersection graphs. In *Automata, Languages and Programming 32nd International Colloquium, ICALP 2005, Lisbon, Portugal, July 11-15, 2005. Proceedings*, pages 690–701, 2005.

[10] E. Godehardt and J. Jaworski. Two models of random intersection graphs for classification. In O. Opitz and M. Schwaiger, editors, *Studies in Classifcation, Data Analysis and Knowledge Organization*, volume 22, pages 67–81. Springer, 2003.

[11] S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Ruciński. *Random Graphs*. Wiley, 2001.

[12] M. Karoński, E. R. Scheinerman, and K.B. Singer-Cohen. On random intersection graphs: The subgraph problem. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 8:131–159, 1999.

[13] L. Pósa. Hamiltonian circuits in random graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 14(4):359 – 364, 1976.

[14] C. Raptopoulos and P. Spirakis. Simple and efficient greedy algorithms for hamilton cycles in random intersection graphs. In *Algorithms and Computation 16th International Symposium, ISAAC 2005, Sanya, Hainan, China, December 19-21, 2005. Proceedings*, pages 493–504, 2005.

[15] K. Rybarczyk. Sharp threshold functions for random intersection graphs via a coupling method. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 18(1):P36, 2011.

[16] K. Rybarczyk. The coupling method for inhomogeneous random intersection graphs. *submitted*, 2015+.